

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-7, 11-20, 23-29 and 32-38 are pending in this application. Claims 8-10, 21-22 and 30-31 are withdrawn. In this Amendment, pending claims 1, 2-7, 13-14, 16-17 and 26-27; and withdrawn claims 8-9 are amended. Claim 2 is canceled, and claims 34-38 are added.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Lao in the December 26, 2006 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 and Objection to the Drawings**

The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 4 has been amended to recite an "electro-optical device according to claim 3, wherein the first effective optical regions are not adjacent to each other." The Examiner agreed in the December 26, 2006 personal interview that this amendment to claim 4 overcomes the §112 rejection and addresses the objection to the drawings. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 4 under §112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that claim 35 has been added to recite an "electro-optical device according to claim 3, wherein the second effective optical regions are not adjacent to each other." Applicants have also amended claim 17 similar to the manner as claim 4; and added claim 36 to recite features similar to new claim 35.

**II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 14-18, 25-27, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Wright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,699) (Wright). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

**A. Independent Claims**

**1. Claims 3, 16 and 27**

Applicants have amended independent claim 3 to recite "each of the whole ineffective optical regions being arranged so as to be sandwiched by two of the first effective optical regions and so as to be sandwiched by two of the second effective optical regions;" amended independent claim 16 to recite "each of the whole non-luminous regions is arranged so as to be sandwiched by two of the first light-emitting regions and so as to be sandwiched by two of the second light-emitting regions" and independent claim 27 to recite "each of the whole non-element-forming regions being arranged so as to be sandwiched by two of the first element forming regions and so as to be sandwiched by two of the second element forming regions."

The Examiner agreed in the December 26, 2006 personal interview that upon the amendment of the phrase "the ineffective optical region" in claim 2 to "the whole ineffective claim region," the rejection of this claim under §102 would be withdrawn. Applicants have similarly amended independent claims 3, 16 and 28; and respectfully submit that the §102 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**2. Claims 1 and 26**

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the features of "wherein the ineffective optical regions are arranged on the (square) lattice so as to be sandwiched between the first effective optical regions in the column direction and sandwiched between the second effective optical regions in the row direction." Applicants have similarly amended independent claim 26. Applicants respectfully submit that Wright does not disclose this feature. For at least this

reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the §102 rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

**B. Dependent Claims**

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of dependent claims 5, 14-15, 17-18, 25 and 32-33 under §102 should be withdrawn at least because of the dependency of these claims to allowable independent claims 1, 3, 16 and 26-27, as well as the additional features these dependent claims recite. Applicants further submit that new dependent claims 34-38 are allowable based at least on their dependency to allowable independent claims.

**III. Rejoinder**

The withdrawn claims all depend from claims that are allowable as discussed above. Rejoinder and allowance are respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Robert M. Jackson  
Registration No. 46,796

JAO:RMJ

Date: January 17, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--